

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OPEN-MINDEDNESS AND
ACCURATE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION

BY

DAVID DONALD SAWATZKY



A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

APRIL, 1968



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Sawatzky1968>

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Relationship Between Open-Mindedness and Accurate Interpersonal Perception" submitted by David Donald Sawatzky in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

The primary intent of this study was to investigate the relationship between "open-mindedness" and accurate interpersonal perception. Specifically, a negative correlation was hypothesized between scores on the Rokeach (1960) Dogmatism Scale and Total Judging Scores derived from performances on the film tests constructed by Cline (1955, 1968) and Cline and Richards (1960, 1961a, 1961b).

The sample consisted of 131 University of Alberta students; 70 graduate students and 61 undergraduate students.

The major hypothesis was not confirmed. However, when correlations were computed between dogmatism scores and scores on the film subtests, a significant negative relationship (at the .05 level) was evident between dogmatism and the subtest called "Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli."

When the total sample was divided into five subgroups according to level of dogmatism, no significant differences were found among these groups on film test performances. The order of the means on subtest performances, however, was interesting. Contrary to expectations, the group with the highest dogmatism scores obtained the highest scores on three of the four subtests.

When comparisons were made between subgroups within the total sample, the following results were obtained:

(1) In comparisons between male and female subjects, no differences were found on either the Total Judging Score on the films or the Dogmatism Score. Females, however, scored significantly higher on two of the film subtests.

(2) In comparisons between graduates and undergraduates, graduate students scored significantly lower on the Dogmatism Scale; that is, they were more open-minded. There were no differences between these two groups on the Total Judging Scores on the films. Contrary to expectations, undergraduates scored significantly higher on one of the subtests.

(3) No differences were found on any of the variables when counseling graduates were compared with other graduate students in education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of those who contributed to the completion of this thesis.

Sincere thanks are due to Dr. H. W. Zingle for his constructive comments and encouragement throughout the development of the project; to Dr. W. H. O. Schmidt and Dr. K. H. Thomson for their interest in the study and their willingness to discuss questions related to it; to Dr. B. E. Walker for consenting at short notice to be on the committee when Dr. Thomson was unable to be present at the oral examination; to the students who participated in the project and the instructors who consented to the use of their classes; to Dan Precht for his assistance with the statistical procedures; and to those fellow graduate students who offered valuable suggestions and assistance.

To his wife Esther, the writer wishes to express his appreciation for marking the protocols from which the data were derived, and for her constant encouragement. To his children, Janet and David, thanks are expressed for providing pleasant diversions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS.	7
Accurate Interpersonal perception and Related Concepts.	7
Background.	7
Measurement	9
The Generality of the Ability	13
Group Differences	15
Relationship to Theories of Perception	17
Open-Mindedness - Theory and Research	21
Background.	21
Theory of Dogmatism.	23
Relevant Correlates of Dogmatism	25
Theory and Research Suggesting a Relationship Between Open-Mindedness and Accurate Interpersonal Perception.	26
III. DEFINITIONS AND HYPOTHESES	30
Definitions	30
Hypotheses.	30
IV. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN	33
The Sample.	33

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Testing Instruments	35
Accurate Interpersonal Perception	
Tests	35
Construction.	35
Scoring Procedures.	40
Validity of the Instrument	40
Reliability	41
The Dogmatism Scale	42
Construction.	42
Validity and Reliability.	43
Administrative Procedures.	44
V. STATISTICAL TREATMENT AND RESULTS.	45
Relationship Between Open-Mindedness	
and Accurate Interpersonal Perception .	45
Differences Among Groups on the Two	
Variables	49
Graduates and Undergraduates	49
Males and Females.	51
Counseling and "Other" Graduate Students	
in Education.	52
VI. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.	53
BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
APPENDIX A	67
APPENDIX B	69
APPENDIX C	76

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Distribution of Sample According to Level of Education	35
II. Correlations Between Dogmatism Scores and Accurate Interpersonal Perception Scores .	46
III. Means and Standard Deviations of Equal Sized Groups, Established on the Basis of Level of Dogmatism, on Interpersonal Perception Tests	48
IV. Significance of Differences, Determined By Analysis of Variance, of Graduates and Undergraduates, on the Dogmatism Scale and the Interpersonal Perception Tests.	50
V. Significance of Differences, Determined By Analysis of Variance, of Males and Females, on the Dogmatism Scale and Interpersonal Perception Tests	51
VI. Significance of Differences, Determined By Analysis of Variance, of Counseling Students and Other Graduate Students, on the Dogmatism Scale and the Inter- personal Perception Tests	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The increased emphasis in recent years on the importance of education has been accompanied by considerable concern about more effective educative procedures. Part of this concern has been focused on the effectiveness of professional educational personnel -- teachers, administrators and counselors. Although it is conceded that specific knowledge and techniques are important, researchers and writers on the educative process also emphasize the personality of the educator as a significant variable. Getzels and Jackson (1964) state their position on this question as follows:

The educational import of an Ichabod Crane or a Mark Hopkins, of a Mr. Chips or a Socrates, is surely not due solely to what he knows, or even what he does, but in a very real sense to what he is (p. 506).

Wrenn (1956) makes the following statement in regard to school counselors: "The counselor as a person, is the most important single factor in counseling (p. 168)."

In spite of the interest in this question, and prodigious research on the subject, very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher or counselor personality, or about the relationship between personality and effectiveness on the job. Studies which have attempted to identify specific personality

traits which characterize "good" and "poor" counselors (Campbell, 1962; Stefflre, King and Leafgren, 1962) or "good" and "poor" teachers (Ryans, 1960) have tended to be somewhat inconclusive. Authors of the usual inventory tabulations frequently conclude that good teachers or counselors are friendly, cheerful, sympathetic and morally virtuous rather than cruel, depressed, unsympathetic and morally depraved. This type of research would not appear to be very useful, since it is conceivable that any human interaction would be better if the above positive characteristics were evident. Also, since teaching and counseling imply a human interaction, it seems implausible that any one personality configuration might be uniquely suited to these professions. Since the effect of one individual upon another is a function of the personality structures of both, it seems unlikely that a personality profile of an "ideal" teacher could be found. The following statement by Tyler (1961) is relevant for describing the teacher as well as the counselor:

Just as there is no one kind of personality essential to one's functioning as husband or wife, mother or father, lover, neighbor, or friend, so there is no one kind essential to the counselor. The thing that does matter is one's attitude or orientation (p. 268).

Tyler's emphasis on general attitudes rather than specific personality traits is reflected in some of the literature on this subject. One attitude or belief system

which is frequently mentioned is that of "open-mindedness", a term which Rubenowitz (1963) sees as having similar meaning to his term "emotional flexibility". Rokeach (1960) defines open-mindedness as,

... the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside (p. 57).

Thus it may be conjectured that the open-minded, or emotionally flexible teacher will be aware of the subtleties of changing circumstances in the classroom. It will be the "open" teacher who will use a variety of methods in implementing plans instead of one or two formats for all situations regardless of circumstance. Stern (1963) has compared good teaching to the improvisations of a jazz artist. Such a musician might accept the discipline of some form and structure but never repeats a theme in quite the same way.

Rogers (1961), in his discussion of the counseling or therapeutic relationship, stresses the importance of the counselor being open to his experience:

He is able to take in the evidence in a new situation, as it is, rather than distorting it to fit a pattern which he already holds. This increasing ability to be open to experience makes him far more realistic in dealing with new people, new situations, new problems. It means that his beliefs are not rigid, that he can tolerate ambiguity (p. 115).

In a number of studies an attempt has been made to relate the "openness" variable to effectiveness of school personnel. Musella (1967), for example, was interested in how open and closed minded school principals would differ in their rating of teachers. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale was used to identify principals who were open or closed minded. The results showed that closed minded principals tended to rate high dogmatic teachers as most effective and low dogmatic, or open-minded teachers as least effective. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between the Dogmatism scores of those teachers selected as most effective and least effective by the open-minded principals. Thus it appears that real differences exist between open and closed minded principals in their selection, description and rating of teachers.

Allen (1967) conducted a study in which he attempted to anticipate the effectiveness of counselor trainees by means of a measure of "psychological openness". The measure used was the Rorschach Index of Repressive Style. As predicted, a direct relationship was found between the freedom with which subjects responded to the Rorschach and the degree of overall competence attributed to them by their superiors.

Studies such as those above frequently use global supervisor ratings of effectiveness. These ratings can be

seen as having their basis in the current image of the "good" teacher or counselor. This image has undergone considerable change in the past few decades. A significant change in the image of the counselor has resulted from the influence of the Rogerian non-directive procedures where the client is seen as the initiating agent responsible for his own actions. This development seems to parallel a renewed emphasis among educators on the child-centered views of Rousseau, Froebel and Dewey. Thus the image of the good teacher is no longer closely associated with discipline and classroom decorum. On the other hand, there is more of a tendency to see the model teacher as one who can effectively interact with, and motivate, his students.

The importance of effective interaction has also been emphasized in studies in the field of counseling. Fiedler (1950), in a frequently quoted study, found that expert therapists of different orientations agreed as to what constituted an ideal therapeutic relationship. The elements characterizing such a relationship were: an ability to understand the client's attitudes, and portrayal of warm interest without emotional over-involvement. In another study, Truax (1963) analysed interviews with clients who ranged from college students to hospitalized schizophrenics. When the interviews of both the improved and deteriorated subjects were analysed,

those subjects who were judged most improved were found to have been in counseling relationships with therapists whose behavior was rated significantly higher on "accurate empathy" than that of therapists who had dealt with patients who deteriorated. In other words, patient improvement was related to a high level of empathy, while patient deterioration was related to a low level of empathy.

Thus, much of the research cited (Musella, 1967; Allen, 1967) lends support to the contention that a relationship exists between open-mindedness and various global measures of good teaching, counseling or administering. There is considerable theoretical support for the idea that the image of the good teacher or counselor is closely tied to the ability to interact effectively with others. One of the important components of effective interaction is the ability to perceive others sensitively and accurately.

A major purpose of the present study is to investigate the nature of the relationship between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception. This study is also designed to determine whether amount of university training is positively related to open-mindedness and accuracy in perceiving others.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS

I. ACCURATE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION AND RELATED CONCEPTS

Background

The ability to accurately perceive and judge others is vitally important in nearly all human relationships. The importance currently accorded to this ability is well expressed by Bender and Hastorf (1950) as follows:

In everyday situations we depend necessarily on our capacity to perceive and predict the behavior, thoughts, and feelings of the other person.... Our socialization is reared on this foundation of perception of persons in terms of prediction. The credit manager forecasts the ability and willingness of the customer to pay his bills. The diplomat forecasts the readiness of his vis-a-vis to accept or reject propositions. The therapist makes not only a diagnosis but a prognosis of his client. All the subtle interchanges of love and friendship rest, however insecurely, on this tenuous skill in perception and prediction (p. 556).

A number of terms have been used to describe this "tenuous skill in perception and prediction." Some of these are -- empathy, accurate interpersonal perception and sensitivity. Although the meanings of these terms are not clearly differentiated, they tend to have somewhat different connotations, which will become evident as this discussion progresses.

Bronfenbrenner, Harding and Gallwey (1958) view

the major recent research in this area as reflecting a convergence of two trends of scientific thought. One trend is exemplified by sociologists such as Mead (1934) and psychologists such as Sullivan (1953). These theorists gave particular attention to the recognition by an individual of other peoples' feelings toward him and the eventual incorporation of these perceived attitudes into his self image. In this tradition, the process of sensing and responding to the thoughts and feelings of others is frequently referred to as empathy.

A second trend of thought is characterized by a concern with the general problem of one person's ability to "understand" another. Among those using the word empathy in this context was Lipps. Lipps is credited by Buchheimer (1963) with coining the term *Einfühlung* in a book which he published in 1909. This term was later translated as empathy and was used to refer to certain aspects of the processes through which one person becomes aware of the thoughts, feelings and motives of another. A clear distinction was drawn between *Einfühlung* (empathy) and *Mitgefühl* (sympathy), with the latter term implying a parallelism in the feelings or emotions of one individual with another. *Einfühlung*, on the other hand, implied a process of interaction.

English and English (1958) exemplify a similar

conception of empathy when they define it as "an apprehension of the state of mind of another person without feeling what he feels (p. 594)."

The studies of Dymond (1949) and Dymond, Hughes and Raab (1952) have to some extent drawn from both the aforementioned trends of thought. They also appear to have had an important influence on the manner in which the empathic process has been and is presently being conceptualized and measured.

Although Dymond and her associates were primarily concerned with the ability to understand others, they also gave considerable attention to the development of the 'self' as a function of the perceived expectations of others.

Dymond (1949) defined empathy as "the imaginative transposing of oneself into the thinking, feeling and acting of another and so structuring the world as he does (p. 127)."

Based on this definition she devised a scale which became a basic model for later measuring instruments.

Measurement

Dymond (1949) devised a test in which subjects, after some interaction with others in groups, were required to rate themselves and the individuals with whom they had interacted. The rating scale employed six dichotomous items such as selfish-unselfish and friendly-

unfriendly. Each subject was required to rate himself and one other individual. Then he was asked to rate the one other individual as he believed that individual would rate himself. Finally, he was to rate himself as he felt the one other individual would rate him. A subject's accuracy score was based on his ability to predict the responses of the other person.

This technique tended to set the pattern for what has become known as the prediction approach to the measurement of empathy, sensitivity or accurate interpersonal perception. In this approach, the typical procedure is to ask a judge to predict the response of another on a questionnaire. The predicted and actual responses are then compared and the difference between them constitutes an "accuracy score."

Bronfenbrenner et al (1958) present a cogent summary of the advantages of this approach.

It is easy to administer. It is "objective": it requires no subjective judgment by the experimenter, the results can be expressed in quantitative terms, and, above all, it all has a kind of literal "face validity" which it seems almost presumptuous to question (p. 33).

Because of its advantages, the prediction approach has gained wide acceptance (Bronfenbrenner et al., 1958; Chance and Meaders, 1960; Cline and Richards, 1960). Different techniques have been used, however, in presenting the person to be judged.

Bronfenbrenner et al (1958) use an interaction approach, which involves the subject in making predictions about people with whom he has interacted. In one such study, Bronfenbrenner and his associates divided a group of students into small discussion groups, and assigned them specific topics to discuss. After an interaction time of about four hours, students were asked to rate themselves and each other on two sets of adjectives. One set represented "desirable" qualities while the other named qualities considered "undesirable." After making his ratings, the student was asked to predict how the other students in his group had rated him and how they had rated themselves, on each adjective. Based on the accuracy of these predictions, first and second person sensitivity ratings could be made.

Chance and Meaders (1960) have used a taped interview to present a subject to be judged. They tape recorded 45-minute interviews with individuals who had previously completed the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Later, subjects were required to listen to the tape recordings and then fill out the EPPS as they thought the interviewees would. Accuracy scores were arrived at by calculating the degree of agreement between predicted and actual ratings on the test.

The filmed interview approach, because of the inclusion of more cues, can be considered as an improve-

ment over the taped interview approach. A well known set of testing instruments using the filmed interview approach has been developed and described by Cline (1955, 1968a) and Cline and Richards (1960, 1961a, 1961b). Judges are shown interview sessions in which interviewees are questioned on subjects such as religious beliefs, strengths and weaknesses, and interests and hobbies. At the conclusion of each film, judges are required to fill out questionnaires about each of the interviewees.

Cline and Richards' approach to measuring accurate interpersonal perception will be more fully discussed in a later chapter.

Smith (1966) in his evaluation of the methods of presentation of persons to judges, indicates that the interaction approach seems closest to everyday reality. From a measurement point of view, however, the approach presents obstacles which Smith summarizes as follows:

The same person is not presented to different judges in the same way; the method is time consuming; and experiments using the method cannot be duplicated because a person appears in a face to face study and then disappears, seldom being available again. For the selection of trainees or for the evaluation of training programs, the method is very time consuming (p. 30).

Filmed interviews have the advantage of presenting the same individual in the same manner to different judges or to the same judge at different times. Interviewees are presented more realistically than when taped interviews

are used. Consequently, this investigator could consider the filmed interview technique to be the most useful of the prediction approaches.

The Generality of the Ability

The increased interest in attempts to measure accurate interpersonal perception or sensitivity has resulted in considerable discussion as to whether it should be considered as a general personality trait. Individuals who have reviewed the literature on this subject have arrived at varying conclusions. Taft (1955), in answer to the basic question, "Is there a general ability to judge others?" answers with a qualified "yes". He summarizes his conclusions as follows:

The contradictions found between studies may be due partly to the low reliabilities of the measures used, and partly to the effect of specific factors such as the type of judgement required, the traits being judged and the subjects used. This problem of specificity arises with all traits, but it seems particularly marked in the case of the ability to judge others; nevertheless, there does seem to be sufficient generality in this ability to justify describing at least some judges as "good" or "poor" (p. 20).

On this question of generality of the ability to judge, Cronbach (1955) published a paper that seriously challenged nearly all previous research in the area of judging accuracy. Using logic, mathematics, and analyses of studies, he demonstrated that most judging experiments in the literature had flaws which rendered

them largely uninterpretable. As a remedy he suggested the possibility of breaking down global judging scores into components. Using Cronbach's methodological proposals as a starting point, Cline and Richards (1960) carried out a number of factorial studies on their own instrument. They concluded that it was possible to measure a general global ability to judge others accurately. However, two factors which appeared to account for what was general in this global measure were, in Cronbach's terminology, "Stereotype Accuracy" and "Differential Accuracy." "Stereotype Accuracy" involves an awareness of the social norm -- the ability to identify characteristics which people have in common and not necessarily the ability to discriminate individual departures from the norm. "Differential Accuracy" involves the ability to detect individual differences. These two components seem to be to some extent independent. Cronbach's findings indicate that one can be an accurate judge because he has an accurate stereotype or because he is able to predict specific differences among individuals, or both.

Bronfenbrenner et al (1958) came to nearly identical conclusions independently and referred to their two components as "Sensitivity to the Generalized Other" and "Interpersonal Sensitivity."

Although researchers tend to agree that the ability

to perceive others accurately is factorially complex, Cline and Richards (1961) and Cline (1968a) feel it is still meaningful to talk in terms of a general trait.

This has numerous precedents in the history of psychology. Intelligence, for example, which has been demonstrated to consist of several independent components, is treated as a meaningful general trait. It is Cline's (1968a) present opinion that the "best" judging measure ultimately will combine all the crucial elements contributing to accuracy in a meaningful and measurable way. However, since the current status of interpersonal perception research is not yet in sharp focus, a fully satisfactory global measure of judging accuracy is not yet available.

Group Differences

A question which has concerned some researchers is whether groups, because of differences in experience, training, or other factors, differ on measures of accurate interpersonal perception. Cline (1968a) reports a study carried out in 1953, in which he used two tests: the Behavior Postdiction Test and the Personality Word Card (which later became the Adjective Check List). He used five groups: (a) 109 undergraduate college students, (b) 106 professionals (clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, and graduate clinical trainees), (c) 47 adult members of a

Protestant church congregation, (d) 43 nursing trainees, and (e) 11 advanced engineering students. When the judges of these five subgroups were compared as to accuracy of judgement, a three level hierarchy was found. Most accurate and proficient were the professionals; that is, the psychiatrists, psychologists, and clinical trainees. At level two were the nursing trainees, and at level three, the college students, members of the church congregation and the advanced engineering trainees. The differences in accuracy between levels one and three on both tests were significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus ability to judge appeared to be directly related to amount of professional contact with people. It was also found that women consistently obtained slightly higher judging scores than men.

Another study comparing groups was conducted by Stelmachers and McHugh (1964). Clinicians and nursing students were required to make predictions about four different subjects on selected MMPI items and several bipolar traits. Findings indicated that global response sets of "Social Desirability", "Normality", and "Assumed Similarity" appeared to account for most of the predictive accuracy. It was found, however, that clinicians did significantly better than nurses with non-stereotype information while the differences between the two groups diminished and became insignificant for the

stereotyped inputs.

Relationship to Theories of Perception

Studies concerned with interpersonal perception lead invariably to a consideration of general theories of perception and how they relate to interpersonal perception.

Gibson (1963) maintains that perception is a function of stimulation. Stimulation refers to the physical energies in the environment to which the sense organs of the individual may respond. Because of limited processing capacities a person can absorb only a small part of the large mass of stimuli impinging upon him. What is processed depends upon the selective attention of the perceiver. Gibson summarizes his position as follows:

Just as the invariant properties of the physical world of objects are not constructed by the perceiver, so the invariant properties in available stimulation are not constructed by him. They are discoverable by the attentive adjustments of his sense organs and by the education of his attention (p. 12).

Thus Gibson sees the environment as a reservoir of possible stimuli for perception. The meaning and information in these potential stimuli is available to the attentive exploratory reception of the organism. The stimuli selected are reflected in the unique experience of the perceiver.

Recently, a group of researchers in the field of

perception have concentrated on the frame of reference or phenomenological field of the perceiver. Ittelson and Cantril (1954) state their position as follows:

Perceiving is that part of the process of living by which each one of us, from his own particular point of view, creates for himself the world within which he has his life's experiences and through which he strives to gain his satisfactions (p. 5).

Snygg and Combs (1959) take a point of view which is similar to that given, when they refer to the self as "the individual's basic frame of reference, the central core, around which the remainder of the perceptual field is organized (p. 146)."

The above mentioned theories of perception are significantly related to interpersonal perception. A person in some respects does not differ from other stimuli as an object of perception. It would appear, however, that our internal frame of reference would affect our perceptions of persons more profoundly than it would our perception of objects around us. In judging people we tend to infer properties and potentialities through information gained via perception. We make inferences about a person's intentions, emotions, attitudes, ideas, abilities, purposes and traits on the basis of what we see. Also, in interpersonal perception, similarity between perceived and perceiver is greater than in person object perception. A consequence of this is that the

perceiver is probably maximally inclined to use his own experience in perceiving another's state or intentions.

Inferences about another person are made on the basis of cues, which can be verbal or non-verbal. On the basis of configurations of cues we form a total picture of an individual. The color of a person's skin, for example, tends to result in his being placed in a grouping with certain preconceived racial characteristics.

Secord (1958) reports a number of studies in which it has been demonstrated that cues influence first impressions in rather significant ways. He reports, for example, that in perceptions of women the amount of lipstick tends to relate positively to sexuality, and that bowed lips produce an impression of being conceited or demanding, immoral, or receptive to the attention of men. Secord also reports research done by Thornton in 1943 wherein persons tend to be perceived as more intelligent, dependable and industrious when wearing glasses than when not wearing them.

It seems apparent that individuals differ in the cues they tend to pick up. There are also great differences in the ways in which these perceived cues are schematized and conceptualized. The perceptual theorists who have been cited, would base their explanation of these differences on the premise that perceptions are primarily a function of the unique past experiences of

the individual and consequently the frame of reference of the perceiver.

Kelly (1955) has based his theory of constructive alternativism on this premise. He believes that each individual develops personal constructs along which he construes the world. He sees these constructs as being bipolar continuums with semantic antagonists at either pole. For example, good versus bad could be one construct. Constructs vary in their "range of convenience" (that is, what the construct may be applied to), and their "focus of convenience" (the area in which it is most useful). A construct is considered permeable or impermeable depending upon the degree to which it can admit new elements into its range of convenience.

The personality factor termed "construct permeability" has been introduced by Kelly to explain variations among individuals in the ability to make accurate perceptions. The individual with the permeable construct system will be best able to evaluate and admit new elements and will therefore perceive and construe his environment most accurately.

Snygg and Combs (1959) take a similar position when they observe that "the characteristic openness to experience of adequate personalities provides such people with a much wider, less complicated, more precise and accurate perception of events (p. 254)."

Thus these theorists appear to confirm the idea

that ability to perceive accurately and objectively is related to a general personality characteristic, variously referred to as construct permeability and openness to experience. Rokeach (1960) refers to this personality dimension as open-mindedness. This concept will be discussed in the following section.

II. OPEN-MINDEDNESS - THEORY AND RESEARCH

Background

Since the beginning of this century considerable interest has been shown in the concept of rigidity, which refers to an inability to acquire new habits or response sets that conflict with old well established habits or mental sets. Rubenowitz (1963) reports that the earliest studies in this general area were concerned about what became known as perseveration. He reports a study by Otto Gross, done in 1902, which distinguished between the primary and secondary functions in the nervous system. Secondary processes referred to the tendency for the process to continue spontaneously after the cessation of a stimulus.

Spearman (1927), who tended to follow this line of thinking, stated that "with some persons there is a tendency for mental processes to persist in activity long after the cessation of conditions to which they were actually due (p. 52)." Spearman referred to this tendency

as his 'p', or perseveration, factor.

The emphasis in studies of rigidity changed somewhat in the early 1950's with the appearance of what became known as the 'set' experiments. In these, the experimenter attempts to induce a set, or a tendency to repeatedly perform a response or pattern of responses. He then measures the time it takes to change this set when it is to the subject's advantage to do so. An example of this type of problem is the water jar test of Luchins (1951). The procedure utilized consists in giving subjects a series of problems all solvable by one method, followed by similar appearing problems solvable by a relatively simpler and more direct method. Subjects who have difficulty switching to the simpler method are considered more rigid than those who change readily.

Another trend in the late forties and early fifties was the tendency to place rigidity research against the background of the whole personality. As an aftermath of World War II several major works were published which were concerned about authoritarianism as manifestations of the rigid personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950; Allport, 1954). These authors looked upon attitudes toward politics, economics and society as manifestations of the total personality. The following statement from The Authoritarian Personality

(Adorno et al, 1950) summarizes this position:

Conventionality, rigidity, repressive denial, and the ensuing break-through of one's weakness, fear and dependency are but other aspects of the same fundamental personality pattern, and they can be observed in personal life as well as in attitudes toward religion and social issues (p. 16).

In order to measure fascist or authoritarian tendencies, the California 'F' or fascism scale was developed.

Theory of Dogmatism

Rokeach (1960) took as his primary point of departure the above mentioned study although he took a somewhat different approach to the subject. Whereas the Adorno et al (1950) study was concerned primarily with "right intolerance" as seen in anti-Semitic attitudes, Rokeach (1960) was concerned with general intolerance:

... an ahistorical contentless way of thinking about intolerance, independent of the specific group discriminated against, equally applicable to different periods of history and to all kinds of intolerance within a given period of history (p. 16).

Rokeach has also been concerned with showing a relationship between social attitudes and cognitive functioning (thinking, memory and perception). The cognitive processes can be thought of as taking place within a person who has already formed a system of beliefs. Thus, approaches taken to problem solving, and perceived cues which result in impression formation, are functions of belief systems.

A belief system is conceived of as an organization

of verbal and non-verbal, implicit and explicit beliefs, sets, or expectancies. It should include every belief and disbelief of every sort that a person may have built up about the physical and social world in which he lives. A belief system represents a total framework for understanding the universe. Rokeach (1960) views systems as having three major dimensions: a belief-disbelief dimension, a central-peripheral dimension, and a time-perspective dimension. The belief-disbelief dimension is based on the assumption that a person's beliefs are organized into two interdependent parts; a belief system and a disbelief system. On this continuum a system is defined as closed to the extent that there is:

... a high magnitude of rejection of all disbelief subsystems, an isolation of beliefs, a high discrepancy in degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems, and little differentiation within the disbelief system (p. 61).

With respect to the central-peripheral dimension:

... the more closed a person's belief system, the more he should evaluate others according to their agreement or disagreement with his system; also, the more difficult should it be to discriminate between and separately evaluate a belief and the person holding that belief. Conversely, the more open the belief system, the less should beliefs held in common be a criterion for evaluating others, and the more should others be positively valued, regardless of their beliefs (p. 63).

Finally, on the time-perspective dimension:

... a narrow, future-oriented time perspective, rather than a more balanced conception of past, present, and immediate future in relation to each

other, is also seen to be a defining characteristic of closed systems (p. 64).

Each of the three dimensions includes attributes which may be tied together to produce a mind which, in its totality, is described as being an open or closed mind. Rokeach (1960) has equated the term dogmatism with closed-mindedness and in setting up his Dogmatism Scale has constructed statements designed to tap the above mentioned dimensions.

Rokeach (1960) suggests the following as a basic dimension of the open or closed mind:

... the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside (p. 57).

Relevant Correlates of Dogmatism

Even though Rokeach (1960) reports that he has found no correlation between performance on the Dogmatism Scale and intelligence, a number of studies indicate possible relationships between level of education and dogmatism. Alter and White (1966) report a 1964 study by Marcus in which 143 college freshmen had a mean score of 146, 52 first year medical students had a mean score of 138, and 54 fourth year medical students had a mean score of 126. Thus a progression is evident in which dogmatism scores are lower as the level of education increases. Kemp (Rokeach, 1960), in a ten year longitudinal

study with 129 students, found that half of his least dogmatic group changed their original vocational preferences in a direction that seemed more demanding from an intellectual standpoint. This was not true of the most dogmatic group.

Although Rokeach does not report sex differences in levels of dogmatism, a major study by Alter and White (1966), using 1,000 males and 1,000 female students at the University of Utah, found that men scored consistently higher than women, and the difference was significant at the .01 level.

III. THEORY AND RESEARCH SUGGESTING A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OPEN-MINDEDNESS AND ACCURATE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION

In the literature on both interpersonal perception and open-mindedness, frequent mention is made suggesting a possible relationship between these two concepts. Openness, by definition, involves an acceptant attitude toward other people. Openness also implies a greater awareness of reality. An open-minded individual should be more aware of reality as it exists outside of himself, instead of perceiving it in preconceived categories. He should be better able to see each new person as he is rather than attempt to fit him into a stereotyped pattern. Thus the characteristic of open-mindedness should be

related to greater realism in dealing with new people as well as new situations and new problems.

This relationship appears to be evident in some of the early studies on empathy. Dymond's (1949) findings indicate that empathic persons are less guarded, more flexible, less hostile, more optimistic, more spontaneous, and more controlled in their emotionality than non-empathic persons. Each of these characteristics can be shown to be related to Rokeach's conception of open-mindedness.

Scodel and Mussen (1953) conducted a study which was designed to investigate the accuracy with which authoritarian and non-authoritarian individuals are able to estimate each other's real attitudes. They hypothesized that, after a period of social interaction between an authoritarian and a non-authoritarian person, the authoritarian would perceive the other person as being like himself in social and emotional attitudes, whereas the non-authoritarian individual would perceive the other person more accurately. College students who scored high on the F-scale (Adorno et al, 1950) were paired with students of the same age and sex who scored low in the same scale. For twenty minutes these students conversed with each other informally on various subjects. After the termination of the conversation, each student was taken to a separate room and given a questionnaire to fill out as he thought the other student with whom he had conversed

would respond to it. The results show that high authoritarians "projected" their own attitudes. By contrast, the non-authoritarians were better able to estimate their partner's attitudes correctly. They not only perceived them as authoritarian, which they were, but also estimated more correctly their responses to other questions.

Crockett and Meidinger (1956) replicated the Scodel and Mussen study using a different population and a different operational definition of accuracy of judgement. They also used more refined measures of profile similarities rather than total scores. The results were very similar to the original study.

Jones (1954) attempted to demonstrate the role of the judge's personality in the formation of first impressions. His study was based on the premise that differences in the way people perceive and evaluate others are a function of measurable variations in the perceiver's personality. Jones confronted "authoritarians" and "non-authoritarians", as measured by the California F-Scale, with information about a prospective leader. He then asked them to assess this person by means of free descriptive comments and a 30 trait rating scale. The results show that in the perception and judgement of others, authoritarians seem to be more insensitive than non-authoritarians to the psychological or personality

characteristics of the others. Authoritarians also tend to be more positively evaluative of the leader than non-authoritarians, regardless of the leader's specific characteristics.

In a study by Burke (1966) Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale was administered twice to 118 college students. For the first administration, subjects were given the usual instructions. Subjects were then asked to answer the scale as they believed that the "average" college student would answer it. It was concluded that subjective judgements of the "average" college student were a function of the judges' own dogmatism. Based on the findings of his study as well as other research with the Dogmatism Scale, Burke hypothesized that non-dogmatics are more socially perceptive than dogmatic persons.

These studies lend support to the main hypothesis stated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

DEFINITIONS AND HYPOTHESES

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions have been adopted for the purposes of this study.

Open-mindedness is defined by Rokeach (1960) as:

... the extent to which a person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside (p. 57).

The Dogmatism Scale has been based on this definition. Thus, for the purposes of this study, open-mindedness will be operationally defined as a score obtained on the Dogmatism Scale, Form E.

Accurate interpersonal perception is defined by Cline and Richards (1960) as "the ability to perceive others accurately (p. 1)." The term will be operationally defined as the scores obtained on the film tests constructed by Cline and Richards of the University of Utah.

HYPOTHESES

It has been shown that both open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception are important qualities in education. A review of relevant research (Dymond, 1948;

Scodel and Mussen, 1953; Crockett and Meidinger, 1956; Jones, 1954; Burke, 1966) seems to indicate a relationship between the two concepts; that those who are open-minded will also be accurate in their interpersonal perceptions and vice versa. The rationale for this might be summarized as follows: On the basis of Rokeach's definition it would appear that the dogmatic individual will not be keenly aware of the emotional and social attitudes of others. Since he cannot tolerate ambiguity he will tend to think of people in rigidly stereotyped categories. His perception of others will be restricted because of his selective attention and his approach to others will tend to be conventional and non-personalized. The open-minded individual will be more objective in his evaluations. Therefore he will be better equipped to use subtle personality cues and make more personalized, insightful assessments of the attitudes and values of others. Hence, the following hypotheses have been formulated.

Hypothesis I. Open-minded individuals will be more accurate in their interpersonal perceptions than will be dogmatic individuals.

Hypothesis II. Several studies (Alter and White, 1966; Rokeach, 1960) suggest a relationship between level of education and open-mindedness. Consequently, it is

hypothesized that graduate students will be less dogmatic than undergraduate students.

Hypothesis III. On the basis of a study reported by Cline (1968), in which psychologists, psychiatrists, and graduate clinical trainees scored significantly higher on two of Cline's tests than did undergraduate students, it is hypothesized that the graduate students participating in this study, all of whom are professional educators, will score significantly higher on the accurate interpersonal perception tests than will undergraduates.

Hypothesis IV. On the basis of Cline's (1968) statement that women consistently obtained higher judging scores than men, it is hypothesized that women participating in this study will score higher on measures of accurate interpersonal perception than men.

CHAPTER IV

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

I. THE SAMPLE

The sample used in this study consisted of 131 students of education; 70 graduate students and 61 undergraduate students. All of these students were enrolled at the University of Alberta during the 1967-68 university term.

The graduate group consisted of 38 members of the Educational Psychology 512 class (Counseling Practicum) plus another 32 first year graduate students in other areas of education such as Educational Administration, Educational Foundations, Elementary Education and Secondary Education.

The group from the Counseling Practicum consisted of those members of a class of 55 students who were able to remain for an extended class period.

The members of the non-counseling group of graduate students were contacted by letter and by telephone. Lists were obtained of all first year graduate students registered in the aforementioned departments. Seventy-two letters (Appendix A) were then distributed to these students in their study rooms in the Education Building, inviting them to participate in the study. Since only 12 responded, an attempt was made to contact those who did

not respond, by telephone. Of the 51 who could be reached by telephone, 20 agreed to participate. Thus from a potential group of 72 graduate students who were contacted, 32 took part in the study.

The undergraduate sample of 61 students was comprised of members of four education classes. Twenty-one were those volunteers from two Educational Foundations 201 classes totalling 60 first year students, who were able to participate at an assigned time. A second group, 25 second year vocational education students, were given the tests during two Educational Psychology 271 periods. Finally, 15 members of a fourth year educational psychology class of about 45 students, who were able to remain for an extended class period, made up the balance of the undergraduate sample. The sample included 86 males and 45 females.

The make-up of the total sample according to level of education, is summarized in Table I.

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE ACCORDING TO LEVEL
OF EDUCATION

Groups		Number in Each Group	Totals
Graduate	Counseling	38	70
	Others	32	
Under- graduate	First Year	21	61
	Vocational Education	25	
	Fourth Year	15	

II. THE TESTING INSTRUMENTS

Accurate Interpersonal Perception Tests

Construction. The judging instruments developed and described by Cline (1955, 1968a) and Cline and Richards (1960, 1961a, 1961b) have undergone a number of revisions. The films and questionnaires used in this study are the result of a series of studies which began in 1957 at the University of Utah. Although black and white films were used in the earlier studies, the recent films are in color. Cline and Richards (1960) state that interviews were filmed at three different locations: an anteroom to a suburban supermarket, a downtown theatre lobby, and a university research laboratory. Interviewees were

recruited from supermarket customers, off the street, and from university classes. All interviewees were given a five dollar merchandise order for participating. The camera and sound equipment were in full view of the interviewee during the filming of the interview. All interviews were conducted by an actor, and interview procedures were sufficiently structured to ensure equivalence over interviews. Subject areas such as the following were probed:

- (a) attitudes in politics,
- (b) religious beliefs and personal values,
- (c) personality strengths and weaknesses,
- (d) hobbies and activities.

In order to compress this wide range of information into a relatively short period of time, interviews were highly structured and are not typical clinical type interviews.

The showing time of the films used by this investigator was 10 minutes each. Since six films were used, the total showing time was 60 minutes. The six interviewees in the films are briefly described as follows:

- (a) a married man, about 50 years of age, who spends much of his spare time working on university courses;
- (b) a male director of personnel about 35 years of age;

- (c) a single girl who is an undergraduate English major;
- (d) a single girl who works as a nurse's aid;
- (e) a 60 year old salesman;
- (f) a widow and retired school teacher.

The authors, in their 1960 publication, discuss the ways in which they arrived at information about a group of interviewees. It is assumed that the basic information about the interviewees in the films used in this study was acquired in similar fashion.

Cline and Richards (1960) state that following the filming of an interview, an intensive study was made of each of the interviewees. During several visits to each of the interviewee's homes they were interviewed intensively and were given the following paper and pencil tests:

- (a) MMPI;
- (b) Strong Vocational Interest Blank;
- (c) California Psychological Inventory;
- (d) a word association test;
- (e) Otis Intelligence Test;
- (f) a multiple choice sentence completion test (taken three times);
- (g) the Gough Adjective Check List (taken three times);
- (h) an 80 item cluster from the MMPI (taken three times);

- (i) a 50 item Likert Trait Rating Scale
(self-rating taken three times).

In addition, five close associates were given intensive interviews concerning their knowledge of the interviewee's behavior and history, and then rated the interviewee on an adjective rating scale.

In selecting these associates, the interviewee was asked to nominate five people who knew him well. An attempt was made to get both sexes, and persons from different generations and status levels (parents, peers, boss, employee, etc.). These five people were then contacted directly by a member of the research team and an interview was arranged.

On the basis of all of the above information the researchers constructed questionnaires for judges to fill out after seeing each filmed interview. The questionnaires used in this study include the following subtests:

(a) Behavior Postdiction -- On this judging instrument the judge is required to "postdict" real life behavior of the person seen in the filmed interview. A sample item would be:

10. How does he behave in an argument?

- _____ (a) Avoids them, will walk away.
- _____ (b) Does not back down easily, may be stubborn.
- _____ (c) Usually will agree with people rather than argue.

There are fifteen items like this which were tailored to each individual separately. An effort was made to ensure that the incorrect alternatives were completely inaccurate and not even partially right.

(b) Adjective Check List -- This instrument required the judge to determine which one of a pair of adjectives five associates of the interviewee agreed described him accurately. A sample item is:

1. _____ (a) Conventional
 _____ (b) Capable.

Cline and Richards (1960) report that in their judgement, the adjectives in each pair were roughly equivalent as to social desirability. There are 20 pairs for each interviewee and the score is the total number correct. The correct answers are those which all five associates agreed were descriptive of the interviewee.

(c) Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli -- This is a 'true' or 'false' type of questionnaire in which subjects are required to fill in the circles beside those statements which were voiced during the interview. A sample item is:

0 FDR will go down in history as one of our best. There are a total of 40 items; 20 are true, and 20 are false.

(d) Perception and Memory of Visual Stimuli -- This is a true or false type of questionnaire in which

subjects are required to fill in the circles beside those statements which are descriptive of the interviewee. Sample items are:

0 balding head

0 gray mustache

There are a total of 40 items; 20 are true and 20 do not apply to the interviewee. Again, a total score is arrived at by adding the correct responses.

The questionnaire for one of the films is reproduced in Appendix B. The formats of the other five are similar to it.

Scoring procedures. The following scoring procedures which are suggested by Cline and Richards (1960) were adopted. The four subtest scores were arrived at by combining the scores for each of the subtests on the six films. So that equal weighting would be given to each subtest, the scores on the four subtests were converted to standard scores ($M=50$, $S.D.=10$).

The Total Judging Score was the mean of the four subtests.

Validity of the Instrument. On the question of validity, Cline (1968b), in a personal communication,

makes the following comment: "Our files are experimental and should not be regarded as finished, polished, carefully validated research instruments."

Because of the difficulty in establishing adequate criteria as to what constitutes sensitivity or accurate interpersonal perception, arriving at a measure of validity is difficult. However, Cline and Richards have built their tests on what appears to be an adequate framework. As has been indicated (Chapter II), their instruments appear to be the best available for the intended purpose. Thus for the purposes of this study the films will be accepted as measures of accurate interpersonal perception. However, it should also be realized that the films and questionnaires will, to some extent, be evaluated on the basis of the findings.

Reliability. In answer to a question regarding the reliability of his film instrument, Cline (1968b) in a personal communication stated the following:

We have found that reliabilities have varied significantly, depending on, to some degree, the nature of the judging population. Therefore I would suggest running some of your own so they would be appropriate to the populations you are using ... and to the particular films shown.

In accordance with Cline's suggestion, a test-retest reliability study was conducted by this

investigator. Three months after their initial exposure to the films, 20 subjects were shown them again. Reliability coefficients were calculated on performances on the subtests cutting across the six films. The following correlations were obtained:

Behavior Postdiction -- .57

Adjective Check List -- .54

Perception and Memory of Visual Stimuli -- .72

Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli -- .85

All of the above correlations are significant at the .05 level.

The Dogmatism Scale

Construction. The procedure used by Rokeach in the construction of the Dogmatism Scale was largely deductive. Various defining characteristics of open and closed systems were scrutinized and then statements were constructed designed to tap these characteristics. Some of the statements used were inspired by spontaneous remarks overheard being made by persons Rokeach thought intuitively to be closed minded. Each statement had to be designed to transcend specific ideological positions in order to penetrate to the formal and structural characteristics of all positions. Dogmatic adherents to such diverse viewpoints are capitalism and communism,

Catholicism and anti-Catholicism, should all score together at one end of the continuum, and should score in a direction opposite to others having equally diverse, yet undogmatic viewpoints.

The form of the Dogmatism Scale used in this study was the 40 item Form E (Rokeach, 1960, pp. 73-80). This scale is shown in Appendix C. Subjects indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each item on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the zero point excluded in order to force responses toward agreement or disagreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1 to 7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of the scores obtained on all items on this test.

Validity and Reliability. Validation studies by the "method of known groups" were carried out by Rokeach, Gladin and Trumbo (Rokeach, 1960, pp. 101-108). Graduate students in psychology selected high and low dogmatic subjects from among their personal friends and acquaintances. The high dogmatic subjects are reported to have scored considerably and significantly higher than the low dogmatic subjects on the Dogmatism Scale.

Reliability figures reported by Rokeach (1960) range from .68 to .93 (p.89). Ehrlich (1961) reports

split-half and five to six month test-retest reliabilities of .75 and .73, respectively.

A test-retest study conducted by this investigator confirmed the high reliability figures reported by Rokeach and Ehrlich. A group of 20 subjects took the test again, three months after initial exposure to it. The Dogmatism Scale yielded a reliability coefficient of .83.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The total testing time for the films and the Dogmatism Scale was approximately two hours. Tests were administered during the period from November 1967 to January 1968.

Prior to seeing the first film the subjects were given a brief period to inspect the questionnaires they would be required to fill out. At the conclusion of this period, the film of the first interviewee was shown. The subjects then filled out the questionnaires regarding the first interviewee. The film of the second interview was then shown. This procedure was repeated until all six films had been shown and all questionnaires completed. The Dogmatism Scale was given to subjects at the beginning of each testing period and filled in whenever there was time between films, or at the end of the period.

CHAPTER V

STATISTICAL TREATMENT AND RESULTS

The statistical procedures used, and the corresponding results, may be considered as falling into two categories:

- (1) Procedures and results with respect to the relationship between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception.
- (2) Procedures and results with respect to differences among groups on the two measures.

I. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OPEN-MINDEDNESS AND ACCURATE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION

After the scores on the Interpersonal Perception Tests were converted to standard scores, and Total Judging Scores were computed for each individual (as explained in Chapter IV), Pearson product moment correlations were computed between the Total Judging Scores and the Dogmatism Scores for the total sample. Correlations were also computed between the Dogmatism Scores and the scores obtained on each of the four subtests.

Tests, to determine whether any of the correlations obtained were significant, were then performed. The results, shown in Table II, indicate that the relationship between the Dogmatism Scores and the Total Judging Scores

TABLE II

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DOGMATISM SCORES AND ACCURATE
INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION SCORES

Interpersonal Perception Tests	Dogmatism	t value	p*
Behavior Postdiction	0.132	1.509	n.s.
Adjective Check	0.069	0.783	n.s.
Verbal Stimuli	-0.190	-2.199	<.03
Visual Stimuli	0.034	1.700	n.s.
Total Judging Score	0.034	0.384	n.s.

* .05 was adopted as the level of significance.

was not significant (at the .05 level). When the correlations between Dogmatism Scores and scores on each of the four Interpersonal Perception subtests were tested for significance, only one of these proved to be significant. This was the negative correlation between the Dogmatism Scores and the subtest referred to in this study as Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli. Since a low score on the Dogmatism Scale indicates open-mindedness, there appears to be a positive relationship between open-mindedness and the ability to perceive accurately and remember verbal stimuli.

The hypothesized relationship between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception was further pursued by dividing the total sample into five approximately equal groups on the basis of scores on the Dogmatism Scale. The

means and standard deviations were calculated for each of these groups on five variables; the Total Judging Score plus the scores on each of the four subtests. Raw scores were used when dealing with the subtests. Again, in order to give equal weighting to each of the subtests, standard scores were used when working with the Total Judging Score. One Way Analyses of Variance were used to determine whether differences between groups were significant. The results, summarized in Table III, showed no significant differences among groups on these variables. The order of the means, however, is interesting. Contrary to expectations, the group with the highest scores on the Dogmatism Scale also obtained the highest scores on three of the film subtests (Behavior Postdiction, Adjective Check List, and Perception and Memory of Visual Stimuli). This group in turn obtained the lowest scores on Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli.

Therefore, the major hypothesis of this study, in which a relationship was predicted between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception, was not confirmed. However, a relationship was established between one of the film subtests, Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli, and open-mindedness.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EQUAL SIZED GROUPS, ESTABLISHED ON THE BASIS OF LEVEL OF DOGMATISM, ON INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION TESTS

Interpersonal Perception Tests		Groups Divided on Levels of Dogmatism					F	p*
		Group 1 85-119 (N=26)	Group 2 120-134 (N=27)	Group 3 135-144 (N=25)	Group 4 145-163 (N=27)	Group 5 164-198 (N=26)		
Behavior Postdiction	Mean	47.50	50.52	47.40	47.96	51.46	1.59	n.s.
	S.D.	7.42	6.25	7.67	7.83	8.17		
Adjective Check	Mean	76.31	77.44	78.52	76.67	78.88	0.42	n.s.
	S.D.	8.01	8.89	8.13	10.07	7.90		
Verbal Stimuli	Mean	198.31	200.26	198.60	195.11	191.85	1.41	n.s.
	S.D.	12.89	11.37	16.01	14.99	15.07		
Visual Stimuli	Mean	173.08	173.59	176.80	174.22	177.31	0.52	n.s.
	S.D.	11.88	12.12	16.18	12.03	14.38		
Total Judging ^a	Mean	49.62	50.60	49.97	49.53	50.35	0.32	n.s.
	S.D.	3.59	3.05	4.89	4.52	4.29		

^a Total Judging mean is based on converted scores.

* $p < .05$

II. DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS ON THE TWO VARIABLES

In Hypotheses II, III and IV, differences were predicted among groups on the Dogmatism Scale and on the Interpersonal Perception Test. The results of these group comparisons are summarized in Tables IV, V and VI.

Graduates and Undergraduates

In Hypothesis II it was predicted that graduates would score lower on the Dogmatism Scale than undergraduates; that is they would be more open-minded. This hypothesis was confirmed. As shown in Table IV, undergraduates scores significantly higher than graduates on the Dogmatism Scale. It is interesting to note that the mean scores in the three undergraduate classes were lower as the level of education increased. The mean score of the regular first year students was 149.86; the vocational education group, which is theoretically in second year had a mean of 145.40; the fourth year group had a mean of 140.47.

In Hypothesis III it was predicted that graduate students would score higher than undergraduates on the Interpersonal Perception Tests. This hypothesis was not confirmed. As shown in Table IV, there was no difference between the two groups on the Total Judging Score. Contrary to predictions, the undergraduate group scored

TABLE IV

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES, DETERMINED BY ANALYSIS
OF VARIANCE, OF GRADUATES AND UNDERGRADUATES, ON
THE DOGMATISM SCALE AND THE INTERPERSONAL
PERCEPTION TESTS

Testing Instruments	Graduates (N=70)		Graduates (N=61)		F ^a	P
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Dogmatism Scale	136.03	23.92	145.72	23.77	5.30	.03
Behavior Postdiction	49.26	4.92	50.96	4.63	5.67	.02
Adjective Check	49.65	5.36	50.58	4.17	1.47	n.s.
Perception of Verbal Stimuli	51.13	6.00	49.06	8.12	3.31	.07
Perception of Visual Stimuli	49.97	5.94	50.32	6.61	0.08	n.s.
Total Judging Score	50.00	3.80	50.23	4.29	0.11	n.s.

Note -- Mean Interpersonal Perception Scores are
transformed scores.

^a 1/129 degrees of freedom.

significantly higher on Behavior Postdiction. The difference between the two groups on Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli was close to the significance level (.07) in the direction hypothesized.

In order to determine whether any differences between these groups were a function of age rather than level of education, an analysis of covariance, with age the covariate, was computed. The results showed that age differences had no significant effect on the results.

Males and Females

In Hypothesis IV it was predicted that females would score higher than males on the Interpersonal Perception Tests. This was not confirmed on the basis of the Total Judging Score. As shown in Table V however, female superiority was significant in two of the subtests; Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli and Perception and Memory of Visual Stimuli. Females were particularly adept in the perception and memory of visual cues.

TABLE V

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES, DETERMINED BY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, OF MALES AND FEMALES, ON THE DOGMATISM SCALE AND INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION TESTS

Testing Instruments	Males (N=86)		Females (N=45)		F ^a	P
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Dogmatism Scale	138.50	24.52	144.44	23.50	1.76	n.s.
Behavior Postdiction	49.87	5.13	50.23	4.50	0.24	n.s.
Adjective Check	50.35	5.21	49.40	4.16	1.53	n.s.
Perception of Verbal Stimuli	49.05	7.37	51.95	6.69	4.16	.05
Perception of Visual Stimuli	48.84	6.27	52.15	5.71	7.55	.007
Total Judging Score	49.53	4.25	50.94	3.71	1.76	n.s.

Note -- All Interpersonal Perception Scores are transformed scores.

^a 1/129 degrees of freedom.

Counseling and "Other" Graduate Students in Education

Because of a lack of adequate theoretical rationale, no differences were hypothesized between graduate students in counseling and those in other aspects of the study of education. Since the data were available, however, these groups were compared in the same way as those in which differences were hypothesized. The results, summarized in Table VI, indicate no significant differences between these two groups on any of the variables tested.

TABLE VI

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES, DETERMINED BY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, OF COUNSELING STUDENTS AND OTHER GRADUATE STUDENTS, ON THE DOGMATISM SCALE AND THE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION TESTS

Testing Instruments	Counseling (N=38)		Others (N=32)		F ^a	P
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Dogmatism Scale	136.08	24.79	135.97	22.84	0.0	n.s.
Behavior Postdiction	48.46	5.09	50.20	4.54	0.21	n.s.
Adjective Check	49.03	5.70	50.40	4.84	1.37	n.s.
Perception of Verbal Stimuli	50.52	4.88	51.84	7.04	0.83	n.s.
Perception of Visual Stimuli	49.95	6.62	49.99	5.03	0.0	n.s.
Total Judging Score	49.95	4.02	50.61	3.43	1.49	n.s.

Note -- Mean Interpersonal Perception Scores are transformed scores.

^a 1/129 degree of freedom.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The rationale for suggesting a relationship between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception was summarized in Chapter II of this thesis as follows:

Open-mindedness, by definition, involves an acceptant attitude toward other people. It also implies a greater awareness of reality. An open-minded individual should be more aware of reality as it exists outside of himself, instead of perceiving it in preconceived categories. He should be better able to see each new person as he is rather than attempt to fit him into a stereotyped pattern. Thus the characteristic of open-mindedness should be related to greater realism in dealing with new people as well as with new situations and new problems.

This rationale is supported in research by a number of studies (Dymond, 1949; Scodel and Mussen, 1953; Jones, 1954; Crockett and Meidinger, 1956; Burke, 1966).

The hypothesis based on this rationale was not confirmed in this study; no significant relationship was found between open-mindedness as measured by the Dogmatism Scale and accurate interpersonal perception as indicated by the Total Judging Scores based on Cline and Richards' films. However, when correlations were computed between open-mindedness and the film subtests, a significant relationship was evident between open-mindedness and the subtest, Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli.

These findings raise several questions, the first of which is closely tied to the validity of the film tests.

Cline (1968b) has indicated that the films are experimental in nature and should not be considered as carefully validated research instruments. The Dogmatism Scale, on the other hand, is well documented with validity and reliability evidence. Since a relationship between open-mindedness and accurate interpersonal perception has considerable support in theory and research, it would seem necessary to re-evaluate the film tests.

It is the view of this investigator, that several factors in the construction of the questionnaires accompanying the films tend to militate against open-minded subjects. First, in order to objectify the measurement of accurate interpersonal perception, the questions were designed in "multiple choice" or "true or false" form. Most of the questions seem to measure the ability to analyse the interviewee with little opportunity given for synthesis of information derived from various cues. Rokeach (1960) reports research in which he found no differences between open-minded and dogmatic individuals in analytical ability. Open-minded persons, however, performed significantly better in tasks calling for synthesis of material. Synthesis of cues would seem to be necessary for a genuine understanding of the thoughts, motives and feelings of the

interviewee. In the one subtest in which some synthesis seems to be required, Behavior Postdiction, the items are constructed so as to require quick categorization. The dogmatic individual, by definition, is more likely to come to firm decisions quickly on limited evidence. Persons who are open-minded will tend to see more alternatives and will be less likely to designate answers as "correct" descriptions.

On the basis of the research and rationale reviewed in the preceding paragraphs, it would be of interest, in future research with Cline and Richards' films, to design questionnaires utilizing free response questions. These might, for example, require a subject to write a paragraph describing how an interviewee might react in a particular situation. Questions like this would provide the subject with an opportunity to synthesize cues as well as to include spontaneous observations which are not asked for in the short answer questions. It could be hypothesized that performances on this type of a questionnaire would correlate with open-mindedness as measured by the Dogmatism Scale. It could also be hypothesized that performance on this type of a scale would be more indicative of ability to understand and relate effectively with others than would performance on the present questionnaire.

A finding of considerable interest in the present study was the significant relationship between open-mindedness

and scores on one of the film subtests, Perception and Memory of Verbal Stimuli. While open-minded subjects were more perceptive of verbal stimuli, there was a tendency for dogmatic subjects to perceive visual characteristics more accurately. This could be explained by reference to the rationale underlying the Dogmatism Scale. Dogmatic subjects, because of generally greater anxiety, tend to be more concerned about the reactions of others to them. Consequently they will be more conscious of the visual characteristics of others. At the same time, it is conceivable that they will tend to "gate out" ^{verbal} ~~visual~~ stimuli, particularly those having to do with contentious subjects, such as religion or politics. This is supported by research done by Snoek and Dobbs (1967). Their study has shown that subjects high in dogmatism showed significantly more emotional arousal (as measured by GSR) in response to statements of opinion by others, whether these statements agree or disagree with their own attitudes. Thus, it appears that dogmatism implies emotional sensitivity to all comparisons of opinion. It could be assumed that because of this emotional sensitivity, or anxiety, high dogmatic subjects would be less likely to perceive accurately, verbal statements involving expression of opinion. They would, on the other hand, be more likely to perceive visual stimuli associated with the maintenance of their defenses.

The relationship shown in the present study between open-mindedness and accurate perception of verbal stimuli, presents interesting possibilities for future research. Rokeach (1960) tends to equate his term "open-mindedness" with Rogers' (1951) phrase, "openness to experience". Certain authors (Rogers, 1961; Maslow, 1954) see "openness to experience" as being synonymous with creativity. Creativity, in turn, has been operationally defined in several of the currently popular theories of the creative process as the ability to generate and produce word associations (Mednick, 1962; Wallach and Kogan, 1965). It would be of interest in future research to determine whether open-mindedness is related to the kind of language facility associated with creativity. This hypothesis would have some support in the research of Hess and Shipman (1965) who suggest a relationship between linguistic codes (Bernstein, 1961) and cognitive style.

The implications for further research which have been mentioned in the preceding discussion, might be summarized as follows:

- (1) Concerning Cline and Richards' film tests, some doubt was expressed as to the effect of the structure of the questionnaire on the validity of the instrument. It was suggested that questions might be devised requiring free response answers. Although these could not be

scored as objectively as those presently being used, they would require a subject to synthesize cues. There would be considerable support for the hypothesis that performance on a questionnaire of this kind would correlate with open-mindedness. It could also be hypothesized that performance on a free response scale would be indicative of ability to understand and relate effectively with others.

(2) A relationship was found in the present study between open-mindedness and accurate perception of verbal stimuli. Open-mindedness is equated by some theorists with creativity, which is frequently defined in terms of verbal fluency or word associations. It would be of interest, in future research, to determine whether open-mindedness, as conceptualized by Rokeach, is characterized by the same kinds of verbal skills associated with creativity.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Allport, G. W. The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Allison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.
- Alter, R. D., & White, B. J. Some norms for the dogmatism scale. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 967-969.
- American Psychological Association, Inc. Publication Manual. Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Astin, H. S. Assessment of emphatic ability by means of a situational test. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 57-59.
- Bender, I. E., & Hastorf, A. H. The perception of persons: Forecasting another person's responses on three personality scales. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 556-561.
- Bernstein, B. Social class and linguistic development: a theory of social learning. In A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, & C. A. Anderson (ed.), Education, economy, and society. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., Harding, J., & Gallwey, M. The measurement of skill in social perception. In D. C. McClelland (ed.), Talent and Society. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958. pp. 29-108.
- Buchheimer, A. The development of ideas about empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10 (1).
- Burke, W. W. Social perception as a function of dogmatism. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1966, 23(3), 863-868.
- Campbell, R. E. Counselor personality and background and his interview subrole behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 329-334.
- Chance, J. E., & Meaders, W. Needs and interpersonal perception. Journal of Personality, 1960, 28, 200-210.
- Cline, V. B. Interpersonal perception. Unpublished manuscript, University of Utah, 1968 (a).

- Cline, V. B. Ability to judge personality assessed with a stress interview and sound-film technique. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50.
- Cline, V. B. Personal communication. Unpublished manuscript, University of Utah, 1968 (b).
- Cline, V. B., & Richards, J. M. Jr. Accuracy of interpersonal perception - a general trait? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60.
- Cline, V. B., & Richards, J. M. Jr. A Comparison of individuals versus groups in judging personality. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1961 (a), 45, (3), 150-155.
- Cline, V. B., & Richards, J. M. Jr. The generality of accuracy of interpersonal perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961 (b), 62, 446-449.
- Combs, A. W., & Snygg, D. Individual behavior: A perceptual approach to behavior. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Crockett, W. H., & Meidinger, T. Authoritarianism and interpersonal perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 378-380.
- Cronbach, L. J. Processes affecting scores on "understanding of others" and "assumed similarity." Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 177-193.
- Dymond, R. F. A preliminary investigation of the relation of insight and empathy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1948, 228-233.
- Ehrlich, H. J. Dogmatism and learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 148-149.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Fiedler, F. E. The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 239-245.
- Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
- Gibson, J. J. The useful dimensions of sensitivity. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 1-15.

- Gollin, E. Forming impressions of personality. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 65-76.
- Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. Child Development, 1965, 36.
- Ittelson, W. H., & Cantril, H. Perception a transactional approach. New York: Doubleday, 1954.
- Jones, E. E. Authoritarianism as a determinant of first impression formation. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 107-127.
- Kelly, G. A. A theory of personality - the psychology of personal constructs. Toronto: George J. McLeod Ltd., 1955.
- Luchins, A. S. On recent usage of the Einstellung effect as a test of rigidity. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 89-94.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. Toronto: Van Nostrand, 1962.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Mednick. S. A. The associative basis of the creative process. Psychological Review, 1962, 69(3).
- Musella, D. Open-closed mindedness as related to the rating of teachers by elementary school principals. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1967, 35(3).
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- Rubenowitz, S. Emotional flexibility-rigidity as a comprehensive dimension of mind. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1963.
- Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.
- Scodel, A., & Mussen, P. Social perceptions of authoritarians and non authoritarians. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48, 181-184.

- Secord, P. F. Facial features and inference processes in interpersonal perception. In R. Tagiuri, & L. Petrullo (ed.). Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958. pp. 300-315.
- Smith, H. C. Sensitivity to people. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Snoek, J. D. & Dobbs, M. Galvanic skin responses to agreement and disagreement in relation to dogmatism. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 195-198.
- Spearman, C. The abilities of men: their nature and measurement. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Stefflre, B., King, P., & Leafgren, F. Characteristics of counselors judged effective by their peers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 335-340.
- Stelmacher, Z. T., & McHugh, R. B. Contribution of stereotyped and individualized information to predictive accuracy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 234-242.
- Stern, G. G. Measuring noncognitive variables in research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (ed.). Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Stewart, D. A. Empathy, common ground of ethics and personality theory. Psychoanalytic Review, 1955, 43, 131-141.
- Stone, G. C., Leavitt, G. S., & Gage, N. L. Two kinds of accuracy in predicting another's responses. Journal of Social Psychology, 1957, 45, 245-254.
- Sullivan, H. S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1953.
- Taft, R. The ability to judge people. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 1-21.
- Torrance, E. P. Rewarding creative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Truax, C. B. Effective ingredients in psychotherapy: an approach to unraveling the patient-therapist interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 256-263.

- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. Theory and research in counseling and psychotherapy. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 42(9), 860-865.
- Tyler, L. E., The work of the counselor. New York: Appleton, Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Wallach, M. A., & Kogan, N. Modes of thinking in young children. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.
- Wrenn, C. G. The counselor in a changing world. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

November 13, 1967

Dear Graduate Student:

May I elicit your support for a research project? This project requires the assistance of graduate students in the first year in residence of a master's program. It involves seeing films and making judgments on individuals interviewed in the film, resulting in an 'interpersonal perception' score. When the results are tabulated your score in relation to the group will be available to you on an individual basis. Please indicate below what time would be most suitable for you and place this letter in the envelope provided in your study room.

This study is under the direction of Dr. H. Zingle of the Department of Educational Psychology. Your cooperation would be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

D. D. Sawatzky,
(Department of
Educational Psychology)

- (1) I am willing to participate on
Thursday, November 16 at 7:30 p.m. _____
- (2) I am willing to participate on
Saturday, November 18 at 9:00 a.m. _____
- (3) I would be willing participate on
the following date. _____

APPENDIX B

FILM G

PD-65-REV

You are to guess how the person you just saw in the film behaves in real life (e.g., at home, on the job, around friends, etc.). Check the one alternative after each question which best describes what his real life behavior is. Do not skip any item!

1. How does she generally get along with people?
☐ a. Is a little shy and reserved.
☐ b. Tends to antagonize others.
☐ c. Likes people and is liked by all those who know her.
2. What does her attitude toward people seem to be?
☐ a. Sometimes is intolerant of faults in others.
☐ b. Likes people, likes to be with them.
☐ c. Desires companionship but is a little distrustful of others.
3. How many people does she usually interact with socially?
☐ a. One other close person.
☐ b. Prefers small groups of others.
☐ c. Prefers large impersonal groups.
4. What kind of social activity does she primarily engage in?
☐ a. Small, informal gatherings.
☐ b. Formal and "dress up" affairs.
☐ c. Engages in very little social activity with others, though may attend movies with a friend.
5. What does her emotional reaction to others seem to be?
☐ a. A little cool and reserved.
☐ b. Usually warm and responsive.
☐ c. Initially very reserved but a little warmer after she becomes well acquainted.
6. How does she usually make decisions?
☐ a. Made by her parents (for all practical purposes).
☐ b. Makes her own decisions.
☐ c. Usually from advice given by her girl friends.
7. How successful is she in getting things done?
☐ a. Effective, accomplishes what she sets out to do.
☐ b. About average in this regard.
☐ c. Has some difficulty finishing what she starts.

8. How would her temperament best be described?
- ☐ a. Excitable, emotional.
 - ☐ b. Changeable, unpredictable.
 - ☐ c. Easy-going, stable.
9. What is her greatest strength? What about herself is she most proud of?
- ☐ a. Her generosity.
 - ☐ b. Personal relations, getting along with others.
 - ☐ c. Great natural leadership ability.
10. What is her primary goal in life?
- ☐ a. To get well educated.
 - ☐ b. To get married and have a family.
 - ☐ c. To achieve outstanding success in her career.
11. How well does she express herself verbally?
- ☐ a. Becomes flustered even when asked to give an opinion.
 - ☐ b. Fairly good, but tends to be nervous.
 - ☐ c. Very able, enjoys speaking before others.
12. How does she react to criticism?
- ☐ a. Takes it and evaluates it. May use or ignore it.
 - ☐ b. Is very sensitive to it and easily hurt, but says nothing.
 - ☐ c. Becomes very defensive and makes excuses.
13. How does she behave under pressure?
- ☐ a. Remains cool and calm, and effectively accomplishes task.
 - ☐ b. Gets a little flustered but effectively accomplishes task.
 - ☐ c. Becomes tense, confused and ineffective.
14. How religious is she?
- ☐ a. Moderately religious and moderate involvement in church affairs.
 - ☐ b. Strong moral beliefs but little involvement in church affairs.
 - ☐ c. Considerably hostile and antagonistic to religion.
15. How does she handle money?
- ☐ a. Spends freely and somewhat impulsively.
 - ☐ b. Thrifty, controls spending.
 - ☐ c. Very strict budgeter, quite tight, even stingy.

FILM G

ACLO-65-REV

Five good friends who know the person in Film G (whose film you've just seen) checked one adjective (in each pair of adjectives below) as accurately describing G. YOU are to CHECK that one adjective (in each pair) which you think or guess G's friends checked. Do not skip any pairs!

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. _____ (a) Realistic | 11. _____ (a) Emotional |
| _____ (b) Self-centered | _____ (b) Moody |
| 2. _____ (a) Good natured | 12. _____ (a) Progressive |
| _____ (b) Insightful | _____ (b) Impulsive |
| 3. _____ (a) Versatile | 13. _____ (a) Insightful |
| _____ (b) Reflective | _____ (b) Responsible |
| 4. _____ (a) Hasty | 14. _____ (a) Serious |
| _____ (b) Frank | _____ (b) Anxious |
| 5. _____ (a) Restless | 15. _____ (a) Idealistic |
| _____ (b) Ambitious | _____ (b) soft hearted |
| 6. _____ (a) Clever | 16. _____ (a) Preoccupied |
| _____ (b) Gentle | _____ (b) Sentimental |
| 7. _____ (a) Excitable | 17. _____ (a) Talkative |
| _____ (b) Discreet | _____ (b) Confused |
| 8. _____ (a) Forceful | 18. _____ (a) Efficient |
| _____ (b) Headstrong | _____ (b) Distractible |
| 9. _____ (a) Healthy | 19. _____ (a) Painstaking |
| _____ (b) Inventive | _____ (b) Industrious |
| 10. _____ (a) Quick | 20. _____ (a) Opportunistic |
| _____ (b) Informal | _____ (b) Deliberate |

FILM G

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are quotations depicting some general opinions and attitudes which might or might not have been said in the interview you have just witnessed. Darken the circle for those that you are fairly certain were voiced in the interview. Please work as rapidly as possible.

- 0 I wasn't born when he (FDR) was in office.
- 0 I'm not old enough to vote.
- 0 I don't attend church, but ... I believe in God.
- 0 I play tennis.
- 0 I go for walks.
- 0 Schedules make me worry about what I have to do.
- 0 I'd rather not plan and take my chances.
- 0 I think I'd like to be married (ten years hence).
- 0 ... I'm not a very good housekeeper ...
- 0 I think that children should have considerable freedom.
- 0 I can sew a little.
- 0 I don't understand football.
- 0 I'm not very good at asserting myself.
- 0 I would be an independent if I were old enough to vote.
- 0 My parents thought that FDR was great.
- 0 I don't like to delegate responsibility.
- 0 Oh, I do like IKE as a man.
- 0 If the decision was easy, indecision would bother me.
- 0 It was important to me that I always do things right.
- 0 You can't play tennis in here.
- 0 I both perople because I talk too much.
- 0 I'm not a good chairman. I'd rather give up the responsibility.

Film G (Cont'd)

- 0 I guess I drink coffee and can't sit still (when worried).
- 0 I love sports.
- 0 I don't have a political affiliation.
- 0 We came close to being a military nation under IKE.
- 0 I wasn't old enough to remember him (FDR) very well.
- 0 I think I'm religious, but other people say not.
- 0 A lot of recent polls say that religion is on the decline.
- 0 I have my own kind of religion and my own cult.
- 0 I'd rather not talk about my own religion.
- 0 Mainly, my recreation is athletically oriented.
- 0 I like to go out and I like to dance.
- 0 There's not much social life in Salt Lake.
- 0 I was there (Washington D.C.) last summer.
- 0 Yes, I date nearly every night.
- 0 I like the liberal attitude that most students have.
- 0 I don't have time to read while I am in school.
- 0 ... I do squeeze in a magazine now and then.
- 0 If I'm married then (ten years hence) I'll be happy.

FILM G

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are some physical and behavioral attributes which might or might not apply to the person you have just seen in the film. Darken the circle for those that you are fairly certain do apply to this person. Please work as quickly as possible.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ short hair | ☐ pointed chin |
| ☐ incomplete answers | ☐ thin nose |
| ☐ shy | ☐ narrow eyes |
| ☐ auburn hair | ☐ light complexion |
| ☐ many hand gestures | ☐ slightly heavy build |
| ☐ long nose | ☐ dark eyes |
| ☐ casual hair-do | ☐ blemished skin |
| ☐ lipstick | ☐ plaid smock |
| ☐ round face | ☐ crooked teeth |
| ☐ blue jacket | ☐ never smiles |
| ☐ thin build | ☐ narrow face |
| ☐ dark complexion | ☐ broad nose |
| ☐ smiles almost constantly | ☐ no lipstick |
| ☐ straight teeth | ☐ few hand gestures |
| ☐ wears earrings | ☐ elaborate hair-do |
| ☐ tired disposition | ☐ casually dressed |
| ☐ wide nose | ☐ little make-up |
| ☐ square chin | ☐ blond hair |
| ☐ blue eyes | ☐ long hair |
| ☐ giggles a lot | ☐ complete answers |

APPENDIX C

NAME _____

DEPARTMENT _____

AGE _____

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Mark each statement on the answer sheet according to how much you agree or disagree with it.

+1: I agree a little	-1: I disagree a little
+2: I agree on the whole	-2: I disagree on the whole
+3: I agree very much	-3: I disagree very much

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems. |
| -3-2-1+1+2+3 | 9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future. |

- 3-2-1+1+2+3 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

- 3-2-1+1+2+3 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

- 3-2-1+1+2+3 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- 3-2-1+1+2+3 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

B29885